

REMARKS

Please cancel Claims 9 and 10 without prejudice. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8, 11-17 and 19-28 are pending. Claims 1, 11 and 21 are amended herein. No new matter is added as a result of the claim amendments. Support for the claim amendments is provided at least by Figure 4B and starting at page 26, line 25.

103(a) Rejections

The instant Office Action states that Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8, 11-17 and 19-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ho (U.S. Patent No. 6,407,757). Applicant has reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submits that the present invention as recited in Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8, 11-17 and 19-28 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Ho.

Claims 1-3, 5, 6 and 8

Independent Claim 1 recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed a computer system that includes “a user interface coupled to said bus and for controlling said display, said user interface comprising a plurality of flexible layers of material fastened to each other along a single edge in a stack, wherein along other edges of said stack said layers are not fastened to each other and wherein said single edge is mounted on and abuts a housing of said computer system along the entirety of said edge” (emphasis added). Claims 2-3, 5, 6 and 8 are dependent on Claim 1 and recite additional limitations.

Applicant respectfully submits that Ho does not show or suggest a number of flexible layers of material fastened along one edge, with that edge in its entirety mounted on and abutting a housing. Figure 2A of Ho, as well as Ho in its entirety,

only shows a user interface coupled to a computer system by what appears to be a cable. That is, for example, looking at Figure 2A of Ho, not one of the edges of the browsing device 100 is connected along its entire length directly to computer 205.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the basis for rejecting Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed, and that Claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant also respectfully submits that the basis for rejecting Claims 2-3, 5, 6 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed, as these claims are dependent on an allowable base claim and recite additional limitations.

Claims 11-17, 19 and 20

Independent Claim 11 recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed a method that includes “changing said display according to the rate of movement of said more than one flexible layers, wherein said rate of movement corresponds to how quickly said flexible layers are moved by a user, said rate of movement measured by the amount of time successive layers of said flexible layers are separated.” Claims 12-17, 19 and 20 are dependent on Claim 11 and recite additional limitations.

Applicant respectfully submits that Ho does not show or suggest that the display is changed according to the rate of movement of flexible layers of a user interface, especially where the rate of movement corresponds to how quickly the user moves the flexible layers. Ho only teaches that pages in a display are flipped more quickly if greater force is applied to the browsing device 200. The amount of time successive layers are separated, as claimed, is independent of force. In other

words, the amount of force being applied is irrelevant to the embodiment of the present invention recited in Claim 11.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the basis for rejecting Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed, and that Claim 11 is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant also respectfully submits that the basis for rejecting Claims 12-17, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed, as these claims are dependent on an allowable base claim and recite additional limitations.

Claims 21-28

Independent Claim 21 recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed a computer system that includes “a user interface coupled to said bus and for controlling said display, said user interface comprising a plurality of flexible layers of material fastened to each other along an edge in a stack, wherein said edge is mounted on and adjoins said housing along the entirety of said edge” (emphasis added). Claims 22-28 are dependent on Claim 21 and recite additional limitations.

Applicant respectfully submits that Ho does not show or suggest a number of flexible layers of material fastened along one edge, with that edge in its entirety adjoining a housing. Figure 2A of Ho, as well as Ho in its entirety, only shows a user interface coupled to a computer system by what appears to be a cable. That is, for example, looking at Figure 2A of Ho, not one of the edges of the browsing device 100 is connected along its entire length directly to computer 205.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the basis for rejecting Claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed, and that Claim 21 is in condition for

allowance. Accordingly, Applicant also respectfully submits that the basis for rejecting Claims 22-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed, as these claims are dependent on an allowable base claim and recite additional limitations.

Conclusions

In light of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejected claims. Based on the arguments presented above, Applicant respectfully asserts that Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8, 11-17 and 19-28 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicant respectfully solicits allowance of these claims.

Applicant has reviewed the references cited but not relied upon. Applicant did not find these references to show or suggest the present claimed invention: U.S. Patent Nos. 5,047,960 and 5,875,269.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP



William A. Zarbis
Reg. No. 46,120

Date: 5/23/05

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060